

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/538,351

Applicant(s)

GUO ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David E. England. (3) _____

(2) Mike Bentley Reg. No. 52613. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 07 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

David England
Examiner's signature, if required

DE

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner and Agent Bentley discussed possible claim amendments to clarify the allowed claims. More specifically that the pulling and fractioning the invention performs can be done to each of the SM objects. The claim language before seemed to only state one SM object then teaches a group of SM objects. Examiner and Agent Bentley came to an agreement that adding the pull be performed for each SM object and a fraction of a SM object is taken, this step being done for each SM object would clarify the claims, i.e., "for each SM object" or something similar. Examiner awaits Applicant's response .